

**EXHIBIT “7”**

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8  
9  
10

11 EVERETT HOGGE AND PRISCILLA HOGGE, No. C07-02873 MJJ

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 A. W. CHESTERTON COMPANY,

15 Defendant.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR AN ORDER  
SHORTENING TIME FOR BRIEFING  
SCHEDULE AND HEARING OF  
MOTION FOR REMAND**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs Everett Hogge and Priscilla Hogge's ("Plaintiffs") Motion for Order Shortening Time For Briefing Schedule and Hearing of Motion to Remand.<sup>1</sup> Also before the Court is Plaintiffs' Request for Intervention of the General Duty Judge.<sup>2</sup> Upon good cause shown, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiffs' Motion for an Order Shortening Time for Briefing Schedule and Hearing of Motion to Remand. The Court **DENIES** Plaintiffs' Request for Intervention of the General Duty Judge.

Defendant John Crane Inc.'s ("Defendant") Opposition brief, if any, shall be filed not later than **11:00 a.m. on June 8, 2007**, and shall not exceed **ten pages** in length. Plaintiffs' Reply brief, if any, shall be filed not later than **3:00 p.m. on June 8, 2007**, and shall not exceed **five pages** in length.

<sup>1</sup>Docket No. 17.

<sup>2</sup>Docket No. 18.

1           The Court will deem the matter submitted on the papers and will set the matter for a hearing  
2 only if necessary.

3  
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: June 7, 2007

  
7 MARTIN J. JENKINS  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**EXHIBIT “8”**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 EVERETT HOGGE AND PRISCILLA HOGGE, No. C07-02873 MJJ

12 Plaintiff,

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO REMAND**

13 v.

14 A W CHESTERTON COMPANY,

15 Defendant.

16  
17  
18 Before the Court is Plaintiffs Everett Hogge and Priscilla Hogge (“Plaintiffs”) Motion to  
19 Remand.<sup>1</sup> Defendant John Crane Inc. (“Defendant”) opposes the motion. The Court having  
20 considered the parties’ arguments and upon good cause shown **GRANTS** Plaintiffs’ motion.

21 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), a defendant in a civil action may remove a case from state  
22 court to federal district court if the district court has subject matter jurisdiction over the case. The  
23 district court has subject matter jurisdiction over a case if there is diversity of citizenship between  
24 the parties or if the action is founded on a claim arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of  
25 the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(b); 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question); 28 U.S.C. § 1332  
26 (diversity jurisdiction); *Ethridge v. Harbor House Restaurant*, 861 F.2d 1389, 1393 (9th Cir. 1988).  
27 Section 1441(b) further provides that if the basis for federal jurisdiction is diversity of citizenship,  
28 removal is available only if no defendant is a citizen of the forum state. As the party seeking to

---

<sup>1</sup>Docket No. 16.

Case 3:07-cv-02873-MJJ Document 30 Filed 06/08/2007 Page 2 of 2

1 remove the action, the defendant bears the burden of establishing that subject matter jurisdiction  
2 exists. *Ethridge*, 861 F.2d at 1393. Because the Court strictly construes the removal statute against  
3 removal, if there is any doubt as to the existence of federal jurisdiction, the Court should remand the  
4 matter to state court. *See Gaus v. Miles, Inc.*, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992).

5 Because the record before the Court does not establish that binding settlement agreements  
6 have eliminated all non-diverse Defendants from the state court action, complete diversity did not  
7 exist as of the time of removal. Accordingly, this Court is without subject matter jurisdiction. For  
8 the foregoing reason, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand.

9  
10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11  
12 Dated: June 8, 2007  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
13 MARTIN J. JENKINS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

**EXHIBIT “9”**

Search - 4 Results - "hopeman brothers"

Page 1 of 2

Source: [Public Records > Find a Business > Corporation, Partnership & DBA Registrations by State > VA Business and Corporation Information](#)

Terms: "hopeman brothers" ([Edit Search](#) | [Suggest Terms for My Search](#))

▼Select for FOCUS™ or Delivery

### VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

**THIS DATA IS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY**

**CERTIFICATION CAN ONLY BE OBTAINED THROUGH THE ISSUING GOVERNMENT AGENCY**

### VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

**Company Name:** Hopeman Brothers, Inc.

**Type:** CORPORATION

**Status:** ACTIVE

**Status Date:** 2/1/2007

**Filing Date:** 2/1/2007

**Duration:** PERPETUAL

**Date of Incorporation/Qualification:** 2/1/2007

**State or Country of Incorporation:** VIRGINIA

**Registered Agent:**

AWH CORPORATION

Status: ACTIVE

Creation Date: 2/1/2007

**Registered Office:**

435 ESSEX AVE STE 101

WAYNESBORO, VA 22980

**Other Name Information:**

HOPEMAN BROTHERS MERGER, INC.

Type: FORMER

**Additional Information:** INDUSTRY: GENERAL

**Filing Number:** 671729

**Stock Information:**

Type of Stock: COMMON

Search - 4 Results - "hopeman brothers"

Page 2 of 2

Authorized Quantity: 100

Change in Stock: NO

**History:**

File Date: 2/5/2007

Type: MERGER-SURVIVOR CORPORATION

File Date: 2/5/2007

Type: NAME CHANGE

Source: Public Records > Find a Business > [Corporation, Partnership & DBA Registrations by State](#) > [VA Business and Corporation Information](#)

Terms: "hopeman brothers" ([Edit Search](#) | [Suggest Terms for My Search](#))

View: Full

Date/Time: Friday, June 8, 2007 - 1:58 PM EDT



[About LexisNexis](#) | [Terms & Conditions](#)

Copyright © 2007 LexisNexis, a division of Reed Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.